

FIRST EDITION. TWELVE O'CLOCK M.

FORTIETH CONGRESS.

The High Court of Impeachment—Closing Argument by Manager Bingham—House Proceeding.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. Washington, May 4, 1868. SENATE. AFTER the reading of the journal, Mr. BINGHAM commenced the final argument for the prosecution. He stated that he took part in these proceedings from no partisan feelings, but with a weighty sense of their solemnity and true meaning...

Mr. BINGHAM held that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment. He argued that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment...

Mr. BINGHAM held that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment. He argued that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment...

Mr. BINGHAM held that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment. He argued that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment...

Mr. BINGHAM held that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment. He argued that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment...

Mr. BINGHAM held that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment. He argued that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment...

Mr. BINGHAM held that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment. He argued that the President is not a party to the crime of treason, but that he is a party to the crime of impeachment...

HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

ST. LOUIS.

Railroad Legislation and What it Costs—Interesting Equity Case—Board of Trade. By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

BRIEF NEWS ITEMS.

The Ohio Legislature will probably adjourn next Wednesday. The North German steamer Smith, from Bremen April 4th, arrived yesterday at New York.

The laborers at Prospect Park, Brooklyn, numbering 1,200, have struck for higher wages. Miss Mary Sterling, another of the Erie Railroad victims, died at Port Jervis, New York, on Sunday.

Thomas Tassell, Cong. Representative from New York, died suddenly on the 30th, while riding in a buggy in Matitokan, N. Y.

The duel at Baltimore yesterday was between Count de Lotum and Gen. A. G. Lawrence, of Rhode Island. Both fired in the air.

Mr. Stanbery called at the Executive Mansion this morning, and subsequently visited Secretary Misickan. He is still very feeble.

The Atlantic Base Ball Club, of New York, made their first appearance for the season yesterday, being in excellent field nine. Score—30 to 12.

T. Zumbush's jewelry store, at Indianapolis, was robbed Sunday night of goods amounting to over one thousand dollars, including seventy watches.

Dr. Nephry, the Hungarian, who was arrested at New York on a charge of forgery, has been discharged, as he is, as he says, against his will, without trial.

SECOND EDITION.

FOUR O'CLOCK A. M.

FROM EUROPE.

Interesting from Great Britain—Parliamentary Debates—The Queen's Speech to Accept the Premier's Resignation—Speeches in the House of Commons.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. GREAT BRITAIN. INTERESTING SCENE IN PARLIAMENT. LONDON, May 4.—Midnight.—There was a very full house at the opening of the session of the House of Commons to-night.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. GREAT BRITAIN. INTERESTING SCENE IN PARLIAMENT. LONDON, May 4.—Midnight.—There was a very full house at the opening of the session of the House of Commons to-night.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. GREAT BRITAIN. INTERESTING SCENE IN PARLIAMENT. LONDON, May 4.—Midnight.—There was a very full house at the opening of the session of the House of Commons to-night.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. GREAT BRITAIN. INTERESTING SCENE IN PARLIAMENT. LONDON, May 4.—Midnight.—There was a very full house at the opening of the session of the House of Commons to-night.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. GREAT BRITAIN. INTERESTING SCENE IN PARLIAMENT. LONDON, May 4.—Midnight.—There was a very full house at the opening of the session of the House of Commons to-night.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. GREAT BRITAIN. INTERESTING SCENE IN PARLIAMENT. LONDON, May 4.—Midnight.—There was a very full house at the opening of the session of the House of Commons to-night.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. GREAT BRITAIN. INTERESTING SCENE IN PARLIAMENT. LONDON, May 4.—Midnight.—There was a very full house at the opening of the session of the House of Commons to-night.

ST. LOUIS.

Railroad Legislation and What it Costs—Interesting Equity Case—Board of Trade. By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. WINDOM rose to a question of privilege, which was understood to be a resolution censuring Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, for writing a letter to Mr. Folsom, abusive of his colleague, Mr. Donnelly.

ST. LOUIS.

Railroad Legislation and What it Costs—Interesting Equity Case—Board of Trade. By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette.

By Telegraph to the Pittsburgh Gazette. St. Louis, May 4.—A bill in equity was filed by Henry F. Vail, Solicitor General, and James Corbett, of New York, against the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company and its officers...

BRIEF NEWS ITEMS.

The Ohio Legislature will probably adjourn next Wednesday. The North German steamer Smith, from Bremen April 4th, arrived yesterday at New York.

The laborers at Prospect Park, Brooklyn, numbering 1,200, have struck for higher wages. Miss Mary Sterling, another of the Erie Railroad victims, died at Port Jervis, New York, on Sunday.